arXiv:1604.04593v1 [math.OC] 15 Apr 2016

Traffic Modeling and Real-time Control for Metro Lines

Nadir Farhi*, Cyril Nguyen Van Phu, Habib Haj-Salem & Jean-Patrick Lebacque

***Abstract*— We present in this article traffic flow and control models for the train dynamics in metro lines. The first model, written in the max-plus algebra, takes into account minimum running, dwell and safety time constraints, without any control of the train dwell times at platforms, and without consideration of the passenger travel demand. We show that the dynamics is stable, and converges to its unique stationary regime. Moreover, the asymptotic average train time-headway, dwell time, as well as safety time, are derived analytically, as functions of the number of moving trains on the metro line. We then introduce, in a second model, the effect of passengers on the train dwell times on the platforms. We review that, if this effect is not well controlled, then the traffic is unstable. Finally, we propose a traffic control model which deals with this instability, by well controlling the effect of passenger arrivals on the train dwell times on the platforms. We show that the dynamic system is stable, and that it converges to its unique asymptotic regime. We then calculate by numerical simulations the asymptotic average time-headway as a function of the number of moving trains, compare the results with those of the max-plus algebra model, and derive the effect of the passenger travel demand on the frequency of the metro line, under the proposed control model.**

Keywords. Traffic control, traffic modeling, max-plus algebra, railway traffic.

I. INTRODUCTION

Although the metro line transport is known to be one of the most efficient, safe, and confortable passenger transport mode in urban and sub-urban areas, it is also known to be naturally unstable when exploited at high frequencies [19]. Indeed, at a high frequency, where the capacity margins are reduced, train delays are amplified and rapidly propagated forward in time, and backward in space. In severe disruptions, the delays may cover the overall railway network. One of the parameters affecting the dwell times of trains at platforms, and by that causing train delays, is the passenger flow time. It is the largest and the hardest parameter to control [30]. If no efficient traffic control is set for the metro line, a small delay may rapidly drive down the train frequency. In order to deal with that, innovative approaches and methods for real-time railway traffic control are needed. We popose in this article discrete-event traffic models, with a control strategy that guaratees train dynamics stability, and that takes into account the effect of passenger arrivals.

We are concerned here by real-time control of the train dynamics in metro lines. As well known, an important control parameter of the train dynamics is the train dwell times at platforms. Indeed, on inter-station links, trains follow given speed and acceleration profiles which they adapt to the train dynamics with respect to their respective leading trains (directly in case of a moving block system, or indirectly by means of a traffic light control, in case of a fixed block system). The control of the train dynamics is not trivial because of the passenger effect on the train dwell times on platforms. Indeed, high passenger densities on platforms and/or in trains, induce additional constraints on the dwell times. This situation can be caused by high level of passenger demand, or by one or more than one delayed train (incidents). A direct consequence of those constraints is the extension of the train dwell times at platforms. The disurbances are then propagates backward for the train dynamics, and forward for the passenger service.

Real-time railway traffic control has been treated since decades, with several approaches (mahematical, simulation-based, expert system, etc.) Cury et al. (1980) [25], proposed an analytical traffic model with a multilevel hierarchical optimization method. Breusegem et al. (1991) [19] developped discret-event traffic and control models, outponiting the nature of traffic instability on metro lines. The authors proposed a linear quadratic (LQ) control approach to deal with the instability. Lee et al. (1997) [29] derived by simulation, minimum time-headways on the orange line of the Kaohsiung Mass Rapid Transit (KMRT), and compared them to existing theoretical formulas. Assis and Milani (2004) [26] solved the train scheduling problem in metro lines by a predictive control method. A stochastic model for the propagation of train delays across the network, has been proposed by Engelhardt-Funke and Kolonko (2004) [31], where the waiting time for passengers changing lines is minimized.

Goverd (2007) [7] developped an algebraic model for the analysis of timetable stability and robustness again delays. The approach permits to evaluate the realizability and stability of timetables by max-plus spectral analysis, and to assess their robustness against delays, using critical path algorithms. The model has been applied to the Dutch national railway timetable. A passenger boarding time model, where dwell time is a function of the time-headway and the OD matrix, is developped by Cao et al. (2009) [27]. Andre [28] studied the linear effect of the passenger alighting and boarding flows, and of the on-board crowding level, on the dwell time. Sun et al. (2013) [24], have proposed a mathematical programming approach to minimize waiting time, where Lagangian duality theory is used to solve the problem. Train schedules that take into account passengers exchanges on platforms, are generated. More recently, Cacchiani et al. (2014) [23] give an overview of recovery models and algorithms for real-time railway disturbance and disruption management.

Université Paris-Est, Ifsttar / Cosys / Grettia, F-77447 Paris - Marne-la-Vallée cedex 2, France.

* Corresponding author: nadir.farhi@ifsttar.fr

The problem for which we propose a solution here is the following. In one side, the train dwell times at platforms need to be extended to respond to an increasing of passenger densities on platforms, or of passenger arrivals, in order to allow passengers to get a train as soon as they get a platforms to which a train arrives. In the other side, by doing that, a delayed arrival train to a given platform will induce more passengers on that platform, and then extended dwell time for the train on that platform, which will induce more delay for the same train for its arrival to the next platform. Therefore, delays are amplified, and the traffic is unstable. The traffic control model we present here, tries to find a good compromise for the control of train dwell times at platforms, that satisfies passengers travel demand, and that assures stable train dynamics.

The outline of this article is as follows. In Section 2, we give a short review on the dynamic programming systems. In Section 3, we present a max-plus algebra discrete-event dynamic model that does not take into account the passenger arrivals to platforms. The model permits, in particular, an analytical derivation of traffic phase diagrams for the train dynamics. In Section 4, we extend the max-plus model in order to take into account the effect of passengers on the train dynamics. We brievely review the natural instability of the train dynamics, when it is not controlled. In Section 5, we propose a modification of the latter model in order to guarantee the stability of the train dynamics, in addition to take into account the passenger arrivals. We show that the traffic dynamics are interpreted as dynamic programming systems of stochastic optimal control problems of Markov chains. We give the whole interpretation of the parameters, and derive the characteristics of the dynamics. The effect of the passenger arrival rates on the time-headway is also shown, under the proposed control strategy. Finally, we draw some conclusions.

II. A SHORT REVIEW ON DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING SYSTEMS

We give in this section a short review on dynamic programming systems, and associated optimal control problems. We present the review in three subsections: A - General dynamic programming systems, B - Dynamic pogramming systems of sochastic optimal control problems, and C - Dynamic pogramming systems of deterministic optimal control problems (Max-plus linear algebra systems).

A. General dynamic programming systems

A map $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be additive 1-homogeneous if it satisfies: $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall a \in \mathbb{R}, f(a\mathbf{1} + x) = a\mathbf{1} + f(x)$, where $\mathbf{1} \stackrel{def}{=} {}^t(1, 1, \ldots, 1)$. It is said to be monotone if it satisfies $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \leq y \Rightarrow f(x) \leq f(y)$, where $x \leq y$ means $x_i \leq y_i \forall 1 \leq i \leq n$. If f is 1-homogeneous and monotone, then it is non expansive (or 1-Lipschitz) for the supremum norm [1], i. e. $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, ||f(x) - f(y)||_\infty \leq ||x - y||_\infty$. In this case a directed graph $\mathcal{G}(f)$ is associated to f.

The directed graph $\mathcal{G}(f)$ associated to $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ [4] is defined by the set of nodes $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and by a set of arcs such that there exists an arc from a node i to a node j if $\lim_{\eta\to\infty} f_i(\eta e_j) = \infty$, where e_j is the jth vector of the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$. We review below an important result on the existence of additive eigenvalues of 1-homogeneous monotone maps.

Theorem 2.1: [3], [2] If $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is 1-homogeneous and monotone and if $\mathcal{G}(f)$ is strongly connected then f admits an (additive) eigenvalue, i.e. $\exists \mu \in \mathbb{R}, \exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(x) = \mu + x$. Moreover, we have $\chi(f) = \mu\mathbf{1}$, where $\chi(f)$ denotes the asymptotic average growth rate of the dynamic system $x^{k+1} = f(x^k)$, defined by: $\chi(f) = \lim_{k\to\infty} f^k(x)/k$.

B. Dynamic programming systems of stochastic optimal control problems

We review here a particular additive 1-homogeneous and monomtone dynamic programming system encoutred in stochastic optimal control of Markov chains. The dynamic system is written

$$x_i^{k+1} = \max_{u\in\mathcal{U}}([M^u x^k]_i + c_i^u), \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n. \qquad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{U}$ is a set of indices corresponding to controls; M^u, for $u \in \mathcal{U}$, are stochastic matrices (i.e. satisfy $M_{ij}^u \geq 0$ and $M^u\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$); and c^u, for $u \in \mathcal{U}$, are gain vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

(1) is the dynamic programming system associated to the stochastic optimal control of a Markov chain with state space $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, transition matrices $M^u, u \in \mathcal{U}$, and associated gains $c^u, u \in \mathcal{U}$. The variable $x_i^k, i = 1, 2, ..., n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ is interpreted, in this case, as the function value of the stochastic control problem.

In the traffic models of train dynamics, we present here, we are concerned with system (1) above. However, the interpretation of systems (1) will be different, in the sense that, in our models, such systems model directly the train dynamics, and are not derived from stochastic control problems.

C. Homogeneous linear Max-plus algebra systems

Dynamic pogramming systems associated to deterministic discrete-time optimal control problems can be written linearly in the max-plus algebra. Max-plus algebra [6] is the idempotent commutative semiring $(\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}, \oplus, \otimes)$ denoted by $\mathbb{R}_{\max}$, where the operations $\oplus$ and $\otimes$ are defined by: $a \oplus b = \max\{a, b\}$ and $a \otimes b = a + b$. The zero element is $(-\infty)$ denoted by ε and the unity element is 0 denoted by e. We have the same structure on the set of square matrices. If A and B are two max-plus matrices of size $n \times n$, the addition $\oplus$ and the product $\otimes$ are defined by: $(A \oplus B)_{ij} = A_{ij} \oplus B_{ij}, \forall i, j$, and $(A \otimes B)_{ij} = \bigoplus_k [A_{ik} \otimes B_{kj}]$. The zero and the unity matrices are also denoted by ε and e respectively.

We are interested on the dynamics of a homogeneous p-order max-plus system

$$x(k) = \bigoplus_{l=0}^{p} A_l \otimes x(k - l). \qquad (2)$$

If we define γ as the shift operator applied on the sequences on $\mathbb{Z}$, such that: $\gamma x(k) = x(k-1)$, and then more generally $\gamma^l x(k) = x(k-l), \forall l \in \mathbb{N}$, then (2) is writen as follows.

$$x = \bigoplus_{l=0}^{p} \gamma^l A_l x = A(\gamma)x, \tag{3}$$

where $A(\gamma) = \bigoplus_{l=0}^{p} \gamma^l A_l$ is a polynomial matrix in the shift operator γ; see [6], [7] for more details.

$\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{\max} \setminus \{\varepsilon\}$ is said to be a generalized eigenvalue [8] of $A(\gamma)$, with assiciated generalized eigenvector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n_{\max} \setminus \{\varepsilon\}$, if

$$A(\mu^{-1}) \otimes v = v, \tag{4}$$

where $A(\mu^{-1})$ is the matrix obtained by valuating the polynomial matrix $A(\gamma)$ at μ^{-1}.

For dynamic systems (3), it is convenient to redefine the arcs of the associated graph $\mathcal{G}$, denoted here, $\mathcal{G}(A(\gamma))$, as follows. For every $0 \leq l \leq p$, an arc (i, j, l) is associated for each non-null ($\neq \varepsilon$) entree (i, j) of max-plus matrix A_l. Moreover, a weight $W(i, j, l)$ and a duration $D(i, j, l)$ are associated to each arc (i, j, l) in the graph, with $W(i, j, l) = (A_l)_{ij} \neq \varepsilon$ and $D(i, j, l) = l$. Similarly, a weight, resp. duration of a circuit (directed cycle) in the graph is the standard sum of the weights, resp. durations of all the arcs of the circuit. Finally, the cycle mean of a circuit c with a weight $W(c)$ and a duration $D(c)$ is $W(c)/D(c)$.

A polynomial matrix $A(\gamma)$ is said to be irreducible, if $\mathcal{G}(A(\gamma))$ is strongly connected.

Theorem 2.2: [6, Theorem 3.28] [7, Theorem 1] Let $A(\gamma) = \oplus_{l=0}^{p} A_l \gamma^l$ be an irreducible polynomial matrix with acyclic subgraph $\mathcal{G}(A_0)$. Then $A(\gamma)$ has a unique generalized eigenvalue $\mu > \varepsilon$ and finite eigenvectors $v > \varepsilon$ such that $A(\mu^{-1}) \otimes v = v$, and μ is equal to the maximum cycle mean of $\mathcal{G}(A(\gamma))$.

$$\mu = \max_{c \in \mathcal{C}} W(c)/D(c),$$

where $\mathcal{C}$ is the set of all elementary circuits in $\mathcal{G}(A(\gamma))$.

III. Max-plus algebra traffic model

We present here a first traffic model for the train dynamics in a metro line. The model describes the dynamics of trains without applying or computing any control of the train dwell times on platforms. It simply writes the train departure times under two constraints on the inter-station travel time (running time + dwell time), and on the safety time between trains. The model of this section does not take into account the effect of passengers on the train dwell times on the platforms.



Fig. 1. Representation of a loop metro line.

Let us consider a metro line of N platforms as shown in Figure 1. In order to model the train dynamics on the whole line, including the dynamics on inter-stations, we discretize the inter-stations space, and thus the whole line, on segments (or sections, or blocks). The length of every segment must be larger than the length of one train plus the maximum safety distance to be respected between any two successive trains. We then consider the following notations.

N	number of platforms.
n	number of all segments of the line.
m	number of moving trains.
L	the length of the whole line.
b_j	$\in \{0, 1\}$: boolean number of trains being on segment j at time zero.
$\bar{b}_j$	$= 1 - b_j \in \{0, 1\}$.
d_j^k	the kth train departure time from node j
a_j^k	the kth train arrival time to node j. (which may coincid with d_j^k in case where j is not a platform, and where the kth train passing from j is not stopping on j.
r_j	the running time of a train on segment j, i.e. from node $j-1$ to node j.
w_j^k	$= d_j^k - a_j^k$ the kth train dwell time on node j, or stop time if node j is not a platform.
t_j^k	$= r_j + w_j^k$: the kth travel time from node $j-1$ to node j.
g_j^k	$= a_j^k - d_j^{k-1}$ the node (or station) safe separation time (also known as close-in time).
h_j^k	$= d_j^k - d_j^{k-1} = g_j^k + w_j^k$: the kth departure time-headway at node j.
s_j^k	$= g_j^{k+b_j} - r_j^k$ (by definition).

We also use underlined and overlined variables to note the maximum and minimum bounds of the corresponding variables respectively. Then $\bar{r}_j, \bar{t}_j, \bar{w}_j, \bar{g}, \bar{h}_j$ and $\bar{s}_j$ and respectively $\underline{r}_j, \underline{t}_j, \underline{w}_j, \underline{g}, \underline{h}_j$ and $\underline{s}_j$ denote maximum and minimum running, travel, dwell, safe separation, headway and s times, respectively.

The average on j and on k (asymptotic) of those variables are denoted without any subscript or superscript. Then r, t, w, g, h and s denote the average running, travel, dwell, safe separation, headway and s times, respectively.

It is easy to check the following relationships.

$$g = r + s, \tag{5}$$

$$t = r + w, \tag{6}$$

$$h = g + w = t + s = \frac{n}{m} t = \frac{n-m}{n} s. \tag{7}$$

The running times of trains on inter-stations are assumed to be constant. The running times t_j of trains on every segment j, are also considered to be constant. They can be calculated from the running times on inter-stations, and by means of given inter-station speed profiles, depending on the characteristics of the line and of the trains running on it. We then have $\underline{t}_j = r_j + \underline{w}_j$ and $\bar{t}_j = r_j + \bar{w}_j$ for every j.

The model we present here is build on two time constraints:

- A constraint on the travel time on every segment j.

$$d_j^k \geq d_{j-1}^{k-b_j} + \underline{t}_j. \tag{8}$$

- A constraint on the safe separation time at every segment j.

$$\begin{aligned} d_j^k - d_{j+1}^{k-\bar{b}_{j+1}} &= a_{j+1}^{k+b_{j+1}} - r_{j+1} - d_{j+1}^{k-\bar{b}_{j+1}} \\ &= g_{j+1}^{k+b_{j+1}} - r_{j+1} \\ &\geq \underline{g}_{j+1} - r_{j+1} = \underline{s}_{j+1}. \end{aligned}$$

That is

$$d_j^k \geq d_{j+1}^{k-\bar{b}_{j+1}} + \underline{s}_{j+1}. \tag{9}$$

The model then conbines constraints (8) and (9), and gives the kth train depatrure time from each segment j, as follows.

$$d_j^k = \max\{d_{j-1}^{k-b_j} + \underline{t}_j, d_{j+1}^{k-\bar{b}_{j+1}} + \underline{s}_{j+1}\},\ k \geq 1, 1 \leq j \leq n, \tag{10}$$

where the index j is taken with modulo n. That is to say that, for the two particular cases of $j = 1$ and $j = n$, the dynamics are written as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} d_1^k &= \max\{d_n^{k-b_1} + \underline{t}_1, d_2^{k-\bar{b}_2} + \underline{s}_2\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \\ d_n^k &= \max\{d_{n-1}^{k-b_n} + \underline{t}_n, d_1^{k-\bar{b}_1} + \underline{s}_1\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

With max-plus notations, and using the γ shift operator, defined on section II, the dynamics (10) is written as follows.

$$d_j = \underline{t}_j \gamma^{b_j} d_{j-1} \oplus \underline{s}_{j+1} \gamma^{\bar{b}_{j+1}} d_{j+1}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n. \tag{11}$$

We denote by d^k the vector with components d_j^k for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. The dynamics (11) is then written as follows.

$$d = A(\gamma) \otimes d, \tag{12}$$

where $A(\gamma)$ is given as follows.

$$A(\gamma) = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon & \gamma^{\bar{b}_2}\underline{s}_2 & \varepsilon & \cdots & \varepsilon & \gamma^{b_1}\underline{t}_1 \\ \gamma^{b_2}\underline{t}_2 & \varepsilon & \gamma^{\bar{b}_3}\underline{s}_3 & \varepsilon & \cdots & \varepsilon \\ & \ddots & \varepsilon & \ddots & & \\ \varepsilon & \cdots & \gamma^{b_j}\underline{t}_j & \varepsilon & \gamma^{\bar{b}_{j+1}}\underline{s}_{j+1} & \varepsilon \\ & & & \ddots & \varepsilon & \\ \gamma^{\bar{b}_1}\underline{s}_1 & \varepsilon & \cdots & \varepsilon & \gamma^{b_n}\underline{t}_n & \varepsilon \end{pmatrix}$$

Theorem 3.1: The dynamic system admits a unique additive eigenvalue μ, which is also its asymptotic average growth rate, and which is interpreted in term of train dynamics, as the asymptotic average time-headway h of the trains. We have

$$h = \mu = \max\left\{\frac{\sum_j \underline{t}_j}{m}, \max_j(\underline{t}_j + \underline{s}_j), \frac{\sum_j \underline{s}_j}{n-m}\right\}.$$

Proof: By Theorem 2.2, we know that h is given as the maximum cycle mean of $\mathcal{G}(A(\gamma))$. Three different elementary circuits are distinguished on $\mathcal{G}(A(\gamma))$; see Figure 2.



Fig. 2. The graph $\mathcal{G}(A(\gamma))$.

- The hamiltonian circuit in the direction of the train movements, with mean $\sum_j \underline{t}_j/m$.
- All the circuits of two links relying nodes j and $j+1$, with mean $\underline{t}_j + \underline{s}_j$ each.
- The hamiltonian circuit in reverse direction of the train dynamics, with mean $\sum_j \underline{s}_j/(n-m)$.

■

An important remark on Theorem 3.1 is that the asymptotic average time-headway of trains depends on the average number of trains moving on the metro line, without depending on the initial position of the trains (initial condition of the dynamic system).

A. Fundamental traffic diagram for train dynamics

By similarity to road traffic, one can define what is called fundamental traffic diagram for train dynamics. In road traffic, such diagrams give relationships between car-flow and car-density on a road section; see for example [13], [14]; also extended to network (or macroscopic) fundamental diagrams; see for example [10], [11], [12], [15], [16], [17].

Let us first notice that the result given by Theorem 3.1 can be written as follows.

$$h(\sigma) = \max\left\{\tau\sigma, h_{\min}, \frac{\omega}{\frac{1}{\underline{\sigma}} - \frac{1}{\sigma}}\right\}, \tag{13}$$

where h is the average time headway, $\sigma = L/m$ is the average space-headway, $\tau = \sum_j \underline{t}_j/L = 1/v$ is the inverse of the maximum train speed v, $h_{\min} = \max_j h_j = \max_j(\underline{t}_j + \underline{s}_j)$, $\omega = \sum_j \underline{s}_j/L$, and $\underline{\sigma} = L/n$ is the minimum space-headway of trains on the line. Relashionship (13) gives the average time-headway as a function of the average space-headway of trains.

One can also write a relationship giving the average time headway in function of the average train density $\rho = 1/\sigma$.

$$h(\rho) = \max\left\{\frac{\tau}{\rho}, h_{\min}, \frac{\omega}{\bar{\rho} - \rho}\right\}, \tag{14}$$

where $\bar{\rho} = 1/\underline{\sigma}$ is the maximum train density on the line.

Let us know denote $f = 1/h$ the average frequency (or flow) of trains on the metro line, which is, as well known, the inverse of the average time-headway of trains. Then, from (14), we obtain a trapezoidal fundamental traffic diagram (well known in road traffic) for the metro line.

$$f(\rho) = \min\left\{v\rho, f_{\max}, w'(\bar{\rho} - \rho)\right\}, \tag{15}$$

where $f_{\max} = 1/h_{\min}$ is the maximum flow of trains that can pass through one segment. $v = 1/\tau$ is the free (or maximum) train-speed on the metroline, and $w' = 1/\omega$ is the backward wave-speed for the train dynamics.[1]

Relationships (13), (14) and (15) show how the average time-headway, and the average flow of trains are changing in function of the number of trains moving on the metroline. Moreover, they give the (maximum) train capacity of the metro line (expressed by the average time-headway or by the average train flow), as well as the corresponding optimal number of trains. Furthermore, Those relationships describe wholly the traffic phases of the train dynamics.

Theorem 3.2: The asymptotic average dwell time w and safe separation time g are given as follwos.

$$w(\rho) = \max\left\{\underline{w}, \frac{h_{\min}}{\bar{\rho}}\,\rho - r, \frac{\omega}{\bar{\rho}-\rho} - \underline{g}\right\}. \tag{16}$$

$$g(\rho) = \max\left\{\frac{\tau}{\rho} - \underline{w}, (r + h_{\min}) - \frac{h_{\min}}{\bar{\rho}}\,\rho, \underline{g}\right\}. \tag{17}$$

where $\underline{w} = \sum_j \underline{w}_j/n, r = \sum_j r_j/n$ and $\underline{g} = \sum_j \underline{g}_j/n$.

Proof: We have

- By (6) and (7), $w = t - r = (m/n)h - r$, then we replace h using (14).
- By (5) and (7), $g = r + s = r + ((n-m)/n)h$, then we replace h using (14). Or diectly form (7), we have $g = h - w$, then we replace h using (14) and w using (16). ■

Figure 3 illustrates the relationships (13), (14), (15), (16) and (17) for a loop metro line of 9 stations (18 platforms), inspired from the automated metro line 14 of Paris [32].

According to Figure 3, the maximum average frequency for the considered metro line is about 51 trains/hour, corresponding to an average time-headway of 71 seconds. The optimal number of moving trains to reach the maximum frequency is 20 trains.

Formulas (16) and (17) are important for the control model we present in Section V, where we consider w as the control vector and g as the traffic state vector, and where the formulas (14), (16), and (17) of the max-plus traffic model will be used.

B. The traffic phases of the train dynamics

Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, and formulas (13), (14) and (15) allow the description of the traffic phases of the train dynamics of the metro line. Three traffic phases are dstinguished. Let us first notice that the average asymptotic dwell time w is not the average on only the dwell times on the platforms, but it includes the ones on every segment. In order to distinguish between these two quantities, we denote by w^* the average asymptotic dwell time on platfoms.

Free traffic phase. ($0 \leq \rho \leq f_{\max}/v$). In this phase trains move freely on the line, which operates under capacity, with big average time-headways. Moreover, the average time-headway is composed of sum of the minimum dwell time

[1]We use the notation w', with a prime, for the backward wave speed, in order to distiguish it with dwell time notation w.



Fig. 3. Fundamental diagram for railway traffic.

with a big average safe separation time. The average dwell time is independent of the number of moving trains, while the average time-headway as well as the average safe separation time decrease rapidly with the number of moving trains on the line. We notice that the average train flow (or frequency) increases linearly with respect to the number of trains moving on the line. Similarly, the average time-headway increases linearly with respect to the average space-headway.

Maximum train-capacity traffic phase. ($f_{\max}/v \leq \rho \leq \bar{\rho} - f_{\max}/w'$). In this case, the metro line operates at its maximum train-capacity. The latter is constant, i.e. independent of the number of moving trains. The average dwell time w increases linearly with the number of the moving trains. The average safe separation time g decreases linearly with the number of moving trains. The average time-headway $h = g + w$ remains constant and independent of the number of moving trains. The optimum number of moving trains on the line is attained at the beginning of the this traffic phase, as the passengers are not taken into account. This optimum number is $Lf_{\max}/v$ corresponding to train density $f_{\max}/v$. However, in the case where passengers are taken into account, it can be interesting to increase the number of moving trains on the line. Indeed, although the average time-headway remains

constant during this phase, the average dwell time increases, while the average safe separation time decreases with the increasing of the number of trains moving on the line. This induces more time to passengers to go onto the trains, in one hand side, and less average safe separation time, so less time for the accumulation of passengers on platforms, on the other hand side, without affecting the average time-headway; see Figure 3. We will see, in the next section (Section IV), the interpretation of that in term of passengers service.

Congestion traffic phase. ($\bar{\rho} - f_{\max}/w' \leq \rho \leq \bar{\rho}$). In this case, trains bother each other on the line, which operates under capacity, with big average time-headways. The average time-headway is composed of sum of big average dwell times with the minimum safe separation time. The latter is independent of the number of moving trains, while the average time-headway, as well as the average dwell time increase rapidly with the number of moving trains on the line. We notice that the average train flow (or frequency) decreases linearly with the number of trains moving on the line.

Before introducing passengers in the dynamics of the metro line, we give here an idea on the effect of the train dynamics on the passengers, in term of the service offered. In other words, we give some insights on the macroscopic average service offered to passengers.

We consider the metro line as a server of passengers, with an average passenger arrival rate λ by platform. Under the assumption of unlimited passenger capacity of trains, the average service rate of passengers by paltform can be fixed to $\alpha w^*/h$, where α is the average passenger upload rate by paltform, and w^* denotes, as indicated above, the average dwell time on a platform. In this case, the system, as a server, is stable under the following condition.

$$\lambda < \alpha w^*/h. \tag{18}$$

IV. Traffic instability due to passengers

We consider in this section, train dynamics where the passengers are taken into account. This is done by assuming that the train dwell time w_j at platform j depends on the passenger volume at platform j, which depends on the safe separation time g_j on the same platform. We consider for this model that this dependence in not controlled. We will see that, in this case, the dynamic system is unstable.

We do not consider in this article a dynamic model for the passenger volumes on platforms. Therefore, we assume that the dwell times on platforms depend directly on the passenger arrival rates.

In order to model the effect of passengers on the train dwell times at platforms, we consider the following additional constraint on the dwell time at plaforms.

$$w_j^k \geq \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda_j}{\alpha_j} g_j^k, & \text{if } j \text{ indexes a platform,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

where α_j is the total passenger upload rate from platform j onto trains, if j indexes a platform; and α_j is zero otherwise; $g_j^k = a_j^k - d_j^{k-1}$ is, as indicated above, the safe separation time on segment j; and λ_j is the average rate of the total arrival flow of passengers to platform j, if j indexes a platform; and λ_j is zero otherwise.

$$\lambda_j = \begin{cases} \sum_i \lambda_{ji} & \text{if } j \text{ indexes a platform} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

λ_{ji} denote here the origin-destination arrival rates of passengers to platform j, with platform i as destination.

By taking ito account the additional constraint (19), the constraint (8) is modified as follows.

$$d_j^k \geq d_{j-1}^{k-b_j} + r_j + \max\left\{\underline{w}_j, \frac{\lambda_j}{\alpha_j} g_j^k\right\}. \tag{20}$$

We now modify the dynamic model (10) by taking into account the new constraint (20). We obtain the following.

$$d_j^k = \max \begin{cases} d_{j-1}^{k-b_j} + r_j + \underline{w}_j, \\ \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_j}{\alpha_j}\right) d_{j-1}^{k-b_j} - \left(\frac{\lambda_j}{\alpha_j}\right) d_j^{k-1} + \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_j}{\alpha_j}\right) r_j, \\ d_{j+1}^{k-\bar{b}_{j+1}} + \underline{s}_{j+1}. \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

Let us notice that the dynamic system (21) has explicit and implicit terms. Moreover, it can be written as follow.

$$d_j^k = \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} [(M^u d^{k-1})_j + (N^u d^k)_j + c_j^u], \tag{22}$$

where M^u and N^u are square matrices, and c^u is a family of vectors. The matrices N^u express implicit terms. We notice here that if $\exists j, \lambda_j/\alpha_j > 0$, then one of the matrices $M^u, u \in \mathcal{U}$ or $N^u, u \in \mathcal{U}$ is not sub-stochastic [2], since we have in this case $1 + \lambda_j/\alpha_j > 1$; see the dynamics (21). Therefore, the dynamic system (21) cannot be seen as a dynamic programming system of a stochastic optimal control problem; see Section II-B.

It is easy to see that if $m = 0$ or $m = n$, then the dynamic system (21) is fully implicit (it is not triangular), and it admits an asymptotic regime with a unique additive eigenvalue $h = +\infty$, which is also the average growth rate of the system, and which is the asympotic average train time-headway. This case corresponds to 0 or n trains on the metro line. No train departure is possible for these two cases. We have the average train flow $f = 0$ corresponding to the average time headway $h = +\infty$ (the additive eigenvalue of the system). One can also show that if $0 < m < n$, then the dynamic system (21) is triangular. That is to say that it is not fully implicit, and that there exists an order of updating the components of the state vector d^k, in such a way that no implicit term appears.

We know that the dynamic system (21) is not stable. We will not give a proof here, but we rather give an intuitive insight. Indeed, as it has already been introduced in the last paragraph of Section III, one can consider the metro line as a server of passengers, with an average passenger arrival rate λ, and with an average service rate $\alpha w^*/h$ (with the assumption

[2]A matrix A is sub-stochastic if $0 \leq A_{ij} \leq 1, \forall i, j$ and if $\sum_i A_{ij} \leq 1, \forall i$.

of infinite passenger capacity of trains). Therefore, the server is stable under condition (18).

In the model considered in this section, and in the passenger congestion case, where the arrivals are sufficiently high that the second term of the maximum operator of the dynamics (21) is activated, we get $w^* = (\lambda/\alpha)g$. Therefore $\lambda = \alpha w^*/g > \alpha w^*/h$ since $g < h$. Hence, the passenger server is unstable, i.e. the passenger flow cannot be served by the metro line. Then, since the dwell times at platforms are constrained by the passenger arrivals ($w^* > \lambda/\alpha g$; see (19)), the instability of serving passengers induces an instability of the train dynamics. The instability of this kind of systems has already been treated; see for example [19].

V. Stable dynamic programming model

In this section we modify the train dynamics (21) in order to guarantee its stability. We know that system (21) is unstable because of the relationship (19). In order to deal with this instability, we propose to replace the dwell time control formula (19), by the following.

$$w_j^k \geq \begin{cases} \overline{w}_j - \frac{\theta_j^k}{\lambda_j^k/\alpha_j^k} g_j^k & \text{if } j \text{ indexes a platform,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

where we reversed the sign of the relationship between the dwell time w_j^k and the safe separation time g_j^k, without reversing the relationship between the dwell time w_j^k and the ratio λ_j^k/α_j^k; and where $\overline{w}_j$ (maximum dwell time on node j) and θ_j^k are control parameters to be fixed.

The dynamics (21) are now written as follows.

$$d_j^k = \max \begin{cases} d_{j-1}^{k-b_j} + r_j + \underline{w}_j, \\ \left(1-\delta_j^k\right) d_{j-1}^{k-b_j} + \delta_j^k d_j^{k-1} + \left(1-\delta_j^k\right) r_j + \overline{w}_j, \\ d_{j+1}^{k-\bar{b}_{j+1}} + \underline{s}_{j+1}, \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

where $\delta_j^k = \theta_j^k \alpha_j^k/\lambda_j^k, \forall j,k$.

If δ_j^k are independent of k for every j, then the dynamic system (24) can be written under the form (22).

As for the dynamic system (21), if $m = 0$ or $m = n$, then the system (24) is fully implicit, and admits a unique asymptotic regime with an average asymptotic train time-headway $h = +\infty$ (no train movement is possible). If $0 < m < n$, then the dynamic system (24) is triangular. In this case, and if δ_j^k are independent of k for every j, then the explicit form of dynamic system (24) can be written in the form (1). If, in addition, $0 \leq \delta_j \leq 1, \forall j$, then M^u and N^u are sub-stochastic matrices, i.e. satisfying $M_{ij}^u \geq 0, N_{ij}^u > 0$, $\sum_j (M_{ij}^u) \leq 1$ and $\sum_j (N_{ij}^u) \leq 1$. In addition, we have $\sum_j (M_{ij}^u + N_{ij}^u) = 1, \forall i,u$. In this case, (24) is a dynamic programming system of an optimal control problem of a Markov chain, whose traisition matrices can be calculated from $M^u, u \in \mathcal{U}$ and $N^u, u \in \mathcal{U}$ (they are the matrices corresponding to the equivalent explicit dynamic system obtained by soving the implicit terms of (24)); and whose gain vectors are $c^u, u \in \mathcal{U}$.

The algebraic system of the stationary regime associated to (24) (which is also its additive eigenvalue problem), is writen as follows.

$$h + d_j = \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} [(M^u d)_j + (N^u (h+d))_j + c_j^u], \tag{25}$$

where h is an eigenvalue and d is an associated eigenvector.

Theorem 5.1: If δ_j^k are independent of k for every j, and if $0 \leq \delta_j \leq 1, \forall j$, then the eigenvalue problem (25) (the algebraic system of the stationary regime) admits a unique eigenvalue h. Moreover, the asymptotic average growth rate of the dynamic system (24), which is the asymptotic average train time-headway, coincides with the eigenvalue h, independent of the initial state vector d^0.

Proof: The proof is quite technical. We only give here a sketch of it. For the whole proof, see Appendix VII. The proof is based on Theorem 2.1. We have seen above that if δ_j^k are independent of k for every j, then the dynamic system (24) can be written under the form (22). Then, under the condition $0 \leq \delta_j \leq 1, \forall j$, the matrices $M^u, u \in \mathcal{U}$ and $N^u, u \in \mathcal{U}$, in the matrix form (22), are sub-stochastic. Therefore, the dynamic system (24) can be seen as a dynamic programming system of a stochastic optimal control problem of a Markov chain, as it has already explained above. The proof consists then in showing that the dynamic system (24), or, more precisely, its explicit form, is additive 1-homogeneous, monotone, and connected. Then, the result follows directly from Theorem 2.1. ■

We do not have yet an analytical formula for the astmptotic train time-headway (which we know that it coincides with eigenvalue h), but Theorem 5.1 guarantees its existence and its uniqueness. Therefore, by iterating the dynamics (24), one can approximate the asymptotic average train time-headway as follows.

$$h \approx d_j^K/K, \forall j, \text{ for a big value of } K. \tag{26}$$

In the following, we give a result (Theorem 5.2) which tells us under which conditions on the control parameters $\bar{w}_j$ and θ_j (or equivalently δ_j), dynamic system (24) is a max-plus linear system, i.e. is equivalent to (10). We will use this result in Section V-A, to give a general approach for fixing the control parameters $\bar{w}_j$ and θ_j in such a way that the effect of passenger arrivals on the train dynamics will be well modelled.

Theorem 5.2: Let $\tilde{h}$ be the asymptotic average time-headway solution of the max-plus linear system (10). The dynamic programming system (24) with parameters $\bar{w}_j = \tilde{h}, \forall j$, and $\delta_j = 1, \forall j$, is a max-plus linear system, whose asymptotic average time-headway coincides with $\tilde{h}$.

Proof: It is easy to see that if $\delta_j = 1, \forall j$, then system (24) is a max-plus linear system whose associated graph has n additional circuits (which are loop-circuits) comparing to the one associated to system (10); see Figure 4. Moreover, if $\bar{w}_j = \tilde{h}, \forall j$, then the cycle mean of the loops are all equal to $\tilde{h}$. All the other parameters corresponding to the characteristics of the metro line and of the trains moving on it, remain the same as the ones of system (10). Therefore,

as in Theorem 3.1, the asymptotic average time-headway h is given by the maximum cycle mean of the graph associated to the max-plus linear system obtained from system (24). Four different elementary circuits are distinguished on that graph; see Figure 4.



Fig. 4. The graph associated to the obtained max-plus linear system.

- The hamiltonian circuit in the direction of the train movements, with mean $\sum_j \underline{t}_j/m$.
- All the circuits of two links relying nodes j and $j+1$, with mean $\underline{t}_j + \underline{s}_j$ each.
- The hamiltonian circuit in reverse direction of the train dynamics, with mean $\sum_j \underline{s}_j/(n-m)$.
- The n loop-circuits with mean $\tilde{h}$.

Hence

$$h = \max\left\{\frac{\sum_j \underline{t}_j}{m}, \max_j(\underline{t}_j + \underline{s}_j), \frac{\sum_j \underline{s}_j}{n-m}, \tilde{h}\right\} = \tilde{h}.$$

■

A. How to fix the control parameters $\bar{w}_j$ and θ_j

As shown in Theorem 5.2, one can simply fix $(\bar{w}_j, \theta_j^k) = (\tilde{h}(\rho), \lambda_j^k/\alpha_j^k)$ in (24), or equivalently $(\bar{w}_j, \delta_j^k) = (\tilde{h}(\rho), 1)$, to obtain a max-plus linear dynamic system, which does not take into account passenger effects, but which therefore optimizes the time-headway of the metro line. Let us highlight here the dependence of $\tilde{h}$, and thus of $\bar{w}_j$, on the density ρ of the moving trains on the metro line.

The question here, is rather, how to fix the control parameters $(\bar{w}_j, \theta_j)$ in order to really model the effect of passengers on the dwell times ? We show below that a convenient way to do so is to fix $(\bar{w}_j, \theta_j)$, in function of the density ρ of moving trains on the metro line, as follows.

$$\bar{w}(\rho) := \bar{w}_j(\rho) = \tilde{h}(\rho), \quad \forall j, \tag{27}$$

$$\theta(\rho) := \theta_j^k(\rho) = \tilde{w}^*(\rho)/\tilde{h}(\rho), \quad \forall j,k. \tag{28}$$

where $\tilde{h}$ and $\tilde{w}^*$ are respectively the asymptotic average time-headway and dwell time on platforms derived from the max-plus linear traffic model.We notice here that the average in $\tilde{w}^*$ is taken only on segments j corresponding to platforms. Moreover, we will show that, in order to guarantee the stability of the dynamic system, independent of the average arrival rates λ_j^k, it is convenient to replace λ_j^k in (24), by $\max(\lambda_j^k, \tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho))$, where

$$\tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho) = \alpha_j^k(\tilde{w}^*(\rho)/\tilde{h}(\rho)), \tag{29}$$

which is also equivalent to keep taking λ_j^k in (24), and replace $\theta(\rho)$ given in (28), by the following.

$$\theta_j^k(\rho) = \frac{\tilde{w}^*(\rho)}{\tilde{h}(\rho)} \frac{\lambda_j^k}{\max(\lambda_j^k, \tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho))}, \quad \forall k,j. \tag{30}$$

Then, since the dynamic system is equivalent to the max-plus linear system (10), at the stationary regime, server-stability condition (18) is writen $\lambda \leq \alpha(\tilde{w}^*(\rho)/\tilde{h}(\rho)) = \tilde{\lambda}(\rho)$; see (29).

Then, for $\lambda_j^k = \tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho), \forall k,j$, we have $(\bar{w}_j, \theta_j^k) = (\tilde{h}(\rho), \lambda_j^k/\alpha_j^k) = (\tilde{h}(\rho), \tilde{w}^*(\rho)/\tilde{h}(\rho))$. Dynamic system (24) is max-plus linear, i.e. it behaves as if passengers do not have any effect on the train dynamics. Basing on that, we assume that $\tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho)$ is a threshold for λ_j^k, i.e. a lower bound for λ_j^k beyond which the passengers will have an effect on the train dynamics.

Let us now fix, on the dynamic system (24), the parameters $(\bar{w}_j, \theta_j^k) = (\tilde{h}(\rho), \tilde{w}^*(\rho)/\tilde{h}(\rho))$ independent of λ_j^k. Then, we have the following.

1) If $\lambda_j^k = \tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho), \forall k,j$, we get the max-plus linear dynamic system, and the passengers do not have effect on the train dynamics.
2) If $\lambda_j^k \geq \tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho), \forall k,j$, we have $\theta_j^k = \tilde{w}^*(\rho)/\tilde{h}(\rho) = \tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho)/\alpha_j^k \leq \lambda_j^k/\alpha_j^k$. Then $\delta_j \leq 1$, and a dynamic programming system is obtained. By Theorem 5.1, the dynamic system admits a stationary regime with a unique asymptotic average train time-headway $h(\rho)$ such that $h(\rho) > \tilde{h}$. In this case, passengers have effect on the train dynamics, and this effect depends on the density ρ of moving trains on the metro line, and can be measured by $h(\rho) - \tilde{h}(\rho)$.
3) If $\exists(k,j), \lambda_j^k < \tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho)$, we have $\theta_j^k = \tilde{w}^*(\rho)/\tilde{h}(\rho) = \tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho)/\alpha_j^k > \lambda_j^k/\alpha_j^k$. Then $\delta_j > 1$. We do not have a guarantee on the dynamic-stability of the dynamic system.

We notice here the difference between server-stability and dynamic-stability. Server-stability condition tells simply that the average passenger arrival rate is less than or equal to the average service rate (traffic supply) of the metro line. Dynamic-stability corresponds to the stability of the dynamic system (24). It is important to notice this difference here, because, the server-stability being satisfied beneath a threshold value on the average arrival rate of passengers corresponding to the average service rate, the dynamic-stabilitiy is satisfied beyond a threshold value on the average arrival rate of passengers corresponding to $\delta_j^k = 1$ in (24), in the model considered here, in contrary to the model presented in Section IV.

In order to treat the dynamic-instability case (item (3) above) corresponding to $\lambda_j^k < \tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho)$, we consider the dynamic system (24) again with control parameters $(\bar{w}_j, \theta_j^k) = (\tilde{h}(\rho), \tilde{w}^*(\rho)/\tilde{h}(\rho))$, but where λ_j^k is replaced by $\max(\lambda_j^k, \tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho))$. Constraint (23) on the dwell time on

platforms is then rewritten as follows.

$$w_j^k \geq \begin{cases} \tilde{h}(\rho) - \frac{\alpha_j^k \tilde{w}^*(\rho)}{\max(\lambda_j^k, \tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho))\tilde{h}(\rho)}\, g_j^k & \text{if } j \text{ is a platform,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{31}$$

The dynamic system (24) is rewritten as follows.

$$d_j^k = \max \begin{cases} d_{j-1}^{k-b_j} + r_j + \underline{w}_j, \\ (1 - \tilde{\delta}_j^k(\rho))d_{j-1}^{k-b_j} + \tilde{\delta}_j^k(\rho)d_j^{k-1} + \ldots \\ \quad +(1 - \tilde{\delta}_j^k(\rho))r_j + \tilde{h}(\rho), \\ d_{j+1}^{k-\bar{b}_{j+1}} + \underline{s}_{j+1}, \end{cases} \tag{32}$$

where $\forall k, j, \rho$,

$$0 \leq \tilde{\delta}_j^k(\rho) = \frac{\alpha_j^k \tilde{w}^*(\rho)}{\max(\lambda_j^k, \tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho))\tilde{h}(\rho)} = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho)}{\max(\lambda_j^k, \tilde{\lambda}_j^k(\rho))} \leq 1. \tag{33}$$

We summarize the latter findings in the following result.

Theorem 5.3: If $\tilde{\delta}_j^k(\rho)$ are independent of k for every ρ and j, then dynamic system (32) admits a stationary regime with a unique additive eigenvalue h, which coincides with the asymptotic average growth rate of the system, independent of the initial state d^0. We have $h \geq \tilde{h}$.

Proof: The proof follows from Theorem 5.1 and from all the arguments given above in this section, in particular from $0 \leq \tilde{\delta}_j(\rho) \leq 1, \forall \rho, j$. ■

B. Numerical results

In Figure 5, we show the curve of $\tilde{\lambda}(\rho)$ in function of ρ or the number of moving trains on the metro line; see (29). The asymptotic average dwell times on platforms $\tilde{w}^*(\rho)$ as well as the asymptotic average train time-headways $\tilde{h}(\rho)$ are derived from the Max-plus linear model (by simulation). The average passenger upload rates α_j^k on trains are fixed to 32 passengers by second from one platform to one train. We notice again that the train capacities in term of number of passengers, are not considered here (i.e. we considered infinite capacities for trains).



Fig. 5. Illustration of $\tilde{\lambda}(\rho)$, which is proportional here to the control parameter $\theta(\rho)$.

Figure 5 gives also the shape of the control parameter $\theta(\rho)$, since $\tilde{\lambda}(\rho) = \alpha\theta(\rho)$, and since α is a constant here.

For p fixed, Figure 5 tells that $\tilde{\lambda}(p)$ is a threshold on the average passenger arrival rate, beneath which, dynamic system (32) is a max-plus linear dynamic system, and beyond which, it is no more max-plus linear, but it is a dynamic pogramming system. Similarly, for $\lambda = \tilde{\lambda}(p)$ fixed, Figure 5 tells that p is a threshold on the number of moving trains on the metro line beyond which dynamic system (32) is a max-plus linear dynamic system, and beneath which it no more max-plus linear, but it is a dynamic pogramming system.

Let us now illustrate the results above on the loop metro line considered in Section III-A, where the average arrival rates of passengers to the line platforms are all equal to 1 passenger by second (symmetric arrivals for all the platforms). We vary this average arrival rate for all the platforms (keeping the same value for all the platforms), in order to derive the effect of passenger arrivals on the train dynamics. The maximum speed considered here is 80 km/h. The passenger upload rates are fixed to $\alpha_j = 32$ passengers by second on all the platforms. The simulation results are shown in Figures 6, 7 and 8.

Figures 6 gives the average train time-headway in function of the number of moving train on the metro line, for different intensities c of the average passenger arrival rates to platforms. The values of c are shown on the figure. Figures 7 and 8 give the asymptotic average train frequency in function of the number of moving trains on the mero line, for varied intensities c of the average passenger arrival rates to platforms.



Fig. 6. Asymptotic average train time-headway in function of the number of moving trains. The average passenger arrivals on the platforms is equal to 1 times a factor c given in the figure.

Figure 7 shows and confims the effect of the control parameter $\theta(\rho)$ (or equivalently $\tilde{\lambda}(\rho)$) on the train frequency of the metro line. It is in particular confirmed that for any passenger arrival intensity c, the value $\tilde{\lambda}^{-1}(c)$ is a threshold on the number of moving trains on the metro line, beyond which the dynamic system is max-plus linear, and thus the line behaves as if the platforms are free of passengers, and beneath which we have a dynamic programming system, in which case the passengers have effect on the train dynamics, and this effect is shown on the average train frequency.

Let us now consider the asymmetric passenger arrival rates on platforms. On the same metro line considered in Section III-A, we consider the arbitrary distribution of the average arrival rates of passengers shown in Figure 9.



Fig. 7. Asymptotic average train frequency in function of the number of moving trains. The average arrival passenger on the platforms is equal to 1 times a factor c given in the figure. The threshold on the number of moving trains to make on the metro line in order to reach the passenger-free case (max-plus model) is shown here, for different values of the average arrival rate λ; see Figure 5. Noice that $c = \lambda$ here.



Fig. 8. Asymptotic average train frequency in function of the number of moving trains, and of the average arrival passenger on the platforms.

The mean of those arrival rates over all the platforms is intentionnaly fixed to 1 passenger by second.

Fig. 9. Average arrival rates λ_j for every platform j, in passenger by second. The mean of those rates is 1.

In Figures 10, we show the dependence of the asymptotic average train time-headway and train frequency on the intensity of passenger arrival rates. We see that, although the mean of the average passenger arrival rates for the symmetric and asymmetric distributions of those rates, is the same (equal to 1), the asymptotic train time-headways and frequencies differ. It seems, from Figure 10, that the maximum of the average passenger arrival rates, over the platforms, counts more than the mean of those rates. In the symmetric arrival distribution case, the maximum is equal to the mean and is 1. In the asymmetric arrival distribution case, the maximum average arrival rate is 3. Then the curve corresponding to $c = 3$ seems to well corresponding to the average arrival rate $c \max_j \lambda_j = 3 \times 3 = 9$. This can be seen on Figures 6, 7 and 10. Indeed, the headway curve corresponding to $c = 9$ in Figure 6, as well as the frequency curve corresponding to $c = 9$ in Figure 7 seem to coincid with the headway and frequency curves corresponding to $c = 3$ in Figure 10. We do not have a proof of this observation.



Fig. 10. Train time-headways and flows in function of the number of moving trains. The arrival passenger rates are varied by multiplication by factor c given in the figure.

Finally, Figures 6, 7, 8 and 10 give the effect of the travel demand on the train dynamics, and on the train capacity of metro lines. They permit also to determine the minimum train time-headway (maximum capacity) of a given metro line, with known or predictable travel demand, as well as the optimal number of moving trains on the line, according to the travel demand. Moreover, the changings of those indicators with respect to the number of moving trains, are made available. All this information can be used for planning, optimisation, and real-time control of railway traffic in metro lines.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We presented in this article a dynamic programming-based approach for modeling and control of the train dynamics in metro lines. The models permit to understand the effect of passengers on the train dwell times on platforms, and by that on the whole dynamics of the trains, and on the train capcity of the metro line. Our next step in this direction is to derive analytical formulas for the asymptotic average time-headway of the metro line under the dynamic programming-based model we presented here.

APPENDIX

VII. PROOF OF THEOREM 5.1

The dynamic system can be writen as a triangular one as long as $m \notin \{0, n\}$. This transofrmation is obtained by replacing implicit terms. Indeed, as $m \notin \{0, n\}$, the position of trains at time zero on the metro line gives a number (at least two) of groups of successive occupied segments $s_p, p = 1, 2, \ldots$. We denote by i_p the indices of the first segments of each group of successive occupied segments. The order of updating the variables d_j^k in the dynamic system is the following.

1) Update the variables $d_{i_p}^k$, for every p, which are, by definition of $i_p, \forall p$, all given by explicit terms. Indeed, these variables correspond to nodes separating an occupied segment i_p and an unoccupied segment $i_p + 1$. Therefore, we have $b_{i_p} = 1$ and $b_{i_{p+1}} = 0$ and then $\bar{b}_{i_{p+1}} = 1$.
2) Update, for every p the variables d_{i_p-1}, $d_{i_p-2}, \ldots$, $d_{i_p-(n_p-1)}$ in this order, where n_p is the number of occupied segments of the group p of successive occupied segments. In parallel, one can update for every p the variables $d_{i_p+1}, d_{i_p+2}, \ldots, d_{i_p+\bar{n}_p-1}$ in this order, where $\bar{n}_p$ is the number of unoccupied segments separating the occupied groups p and $p+1$.
3) Finally, update the remaining variables $d_{p-(n_p)}$ for every p, which correspond to the nodes upstream of the last occupied segment of each group of successive occupied segments.



Fig. 11. The dynamic system is triangular and is connected. The arrows below the line show the connectedness of all the nodes of groupe (p), according to the proof scenario of connectedness.

The equivalent explicit dynamic system is additive 1-homogeneous and monotone, as a composition of additive 1-homogeneous and monotone ones. Indeed, passing from implicit triangular system to an explicit dynamic system is done by compositions.

Let us now show that the equivalent triangular system is connected. In the process of transforming the dynamic system from its implicit to its explicit form, only the implicit terms are replaced at every step. Therefore, the explicit terms remain the same in the final explicit system. We will use those explicit terms in the initial system (24) in order to show that the explicit system is connected. We again consider the notations above on the groups of successive occupied segments. We will show, by using, in particular, explicit terms of the dynamic system (24), that the graph associated to the final explicit system is connected.

- For every occupied segment j, there exists a link from the node corresponding to the variable d_{j-1} to the node corresponding to the variable d_j, in the graph associated to the dynamic system. In the example of Figure 11, those links correspond to $(i_p - 3) \to (i_p - 2) \to (i_p - 1) \to (i_p)$.
- For every unoccupied segment j, there exists a link from the node corresponding to the variable d_j to the node corresponding to the variable d_{j-1}, in the graph associated to the dynamic system. In the example of Figure 11, those links correspond to $(i_{p+1} - 1) \to (i_p + 2) \to (i_p + 1) \to (i_p)$.
- Let us consider two successive occupied groups s_p and s_{p+1} of occupied segments, as in Figure 11. Then by replacement of implicit terms, we can show that there exists a link from node $(i_p - 1)$ to node $(i_{p+1} - 1)$. Similarly, we can also show that there exist a link from node $(i_p + 1)$ to node $(i_p - 3)$; see Figure 11.

Hence, all the nodes of the graph associated to the dynamic system are connected. Therefore, the result follows from Theorem 2.1. ■

REFERENCES

[1] M. G. Candrall and L. Tartar, Some relations between non expansive and order preserving maps, Proceedings of the AMS, vol. 78, no. 3, pp. 385-390. 1980.

[2] J. Gunawardena and M. Keane, On the existence of cycle times for some nonexpansive maps, Technical Report HPL-BRIMS-95-003, HewlettPackard Labs, 1995.

[3] S. Gaubert and J. Gunawardena, A non-linear hierarchy for discrete event dynamical systems, In Proceedings of the 4th IEE - WODES, Cagliari, 1998

[4] S. Gaubert and J. Gunawardena, Existence of Eigenvectors for Monotone Homogeneous Functions, Hewlett-Packard Technical Report HPL-BRIMS-99-08, 1999.

[5] E. Kohlberg, Invariant helf-lines of nonexpansive piecewise-linear transformations, Math. Oper. Res., vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 366?372, 1980.

[6] F. Baccelli, G. Cohen, G. J. Olsder and J.-P. Quadrat, Synchronization and linearity : an algebra for discrete event systems, John Wiley and Sons, 1992.

[7] Rob M.P. Goverde, Railway timetable stability analysis using max-plus system theory, in Transportation Research Part B, Volume 41, Issue 2, February 2007, Pages 179?201.

[8] J. Cochet-Terrasson, G. Cohen, S. Gaubert, M. McGettrick, J.-P. Quadrat, Numerical computation of spectral elements in maxplus algebra. In: IFAC Conference on System Structure and Control, Nantes, France. 1998.

[9] Nadir Farhi, Modlisation Minplus et Commande du Trafic de Villes Rgulires. PhD thesis - Universit Panthon-Sorbonne Paris 1. 2008.

[10] Nadir Farhi, Maurice Goursat, Jean-Pierre Quadrat, Derivation of the fundamental traffic diagram for two circular roads and a crossing using minplus algebra and Petri net modeling. IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, and European Control Conference. CDC-ECC'05. 2005.

[11] Nadir Farhi, Maurice Goursat, Jean-Pierre Quadrat, The traffic phases of road networks. in Transportation Research part C: emerging technologies 19 (1), 85-102. 2011.

[12] Nadir Farhi, Maurice Goursat, Jean-Pierre Quadrat, Fundamental traffic diagrams of elementary road networks. in European Control Conference (ECC), 4944-4951. 2007.

[13] Nadir Farhi, Piecewise linear car-following modeling. in Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies 25, 100-112. 2012.

[14] Nadir Farhi, Habib Haj-Salem, Jean-Patrick Lebacque, Multi-Anticipative Piecewise Linear Car-Following Model. in Transportation Research Record 2013.

[15] Nadir Farhi, Modeling and control of elementary 2D-Traffic systems using Petri nets and minplus algebra. in IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, 2292-2297. 2009.

[16] Nadir Farhi, Maurice Goursat, Jean-Pierre Quadrat, Road Traffic Models using Petri Nets and Minplus Algebra. in Traffic and Granular Flow, 281-286. 2007.

[17] Nadir Farhi, Maurice Goursat, Jean-Pierre Quadrat, Piecewise linear concave dynamical systems appearing in the microscopic traffic modeling. Linear Algebra and its Applications, 435 (7), 1711-1735. 2011.

[18] Nadir Farhi, A class of periodic minplus homogeneous dynamical systems. in Contemporary Mathematics 14, 159. 2009.

[19] Vi Van Breusegem, G. Campion, and G. Bastin. Traffic Modeling and State Feedback Control for Metro Lines. IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON AUTOMATIC CONTROL, VOL. 36, NO. 7, JULY 1991.

[20] Braker, J.G. Algorithms and applications in timed discrete event systems. Ph.D. thesis, Delft University of Technology, Delft. 1993.

[21] Goverde, R.M.P. Punctuality of railway operations and timetable stability analysis. Ph.D. thesis, Delft University of Technology, Delft. 2005.

[22] Heidergott, B., De Vries, R. Towards a control theory for public transportation networks. Discrete Event Dynamic Systems 11 (4), 371?398. 2001.

[23] Valentina Cacchiani, Dennis Huisman, Martin Kidd, Leo Kroon, Paolo Toth, Lucas Veelenturf, Joris Wagenaar, An Overview of Recovery Models and Algorithms for Real-time Railway Rescheduling. Transportation Research Part B. Volume 63, Pages 1537. 2014.

[24] Xubin Sun, Shaobo Zhang, Hairong Dong, and Hainan Zhu, Optimal Train Schedule With Headway And Passenger Flow Dynamic Models. IEEE 2013.

[25] J. E. Cury, F. A. C. Gomide, and M. J. Mendes, A methodology for generation of optimal schedules for an underground rail system, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. l25, no. 2, pp. 217-222, 1980.

[26] W. O. Assis, B. E. A. Milani. Generation of optimal schedules for metro lines using model predictive control. Automatica, vol. 40, no. 8, pp. 1397-1404, Aug. 2004.

[27] S. H. Cao, Z. Z. Yuan, D. Zhao, Characteristics analysis and model establishment for passenger boarding time in urban rail transit. Journal of the China Railway Society, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 89-93, Mar. 2009.

[28] A. Andre, Dwell time model and analysis for the MBTA Red Line, Available online: http://ocw.nur.ac.rw.

[29] Chi-Kang LEE, THE MINIMUM HEADWAY OF A RAIL TRANSIT LINE. Joumal of the Eastem Asia Society for Transportation Studies, Vol. 2, No. 1, Autumn, 1997.

[30] Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual, Third Edition.

[31] O. Engelhardt-Funke and M. Kolonko. Analysing stability and investments in railway networks using advanced evolutionary algorithms. Intl. Trans. in Op. Res. 11, 381394. 2004.

[32] http://www.evous.fr/Metro-Ligne-14-a-Paris-Saint-Lazare-Olympiades-1134119.html#1AFwEC60dx6dsMwa.99